

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: August 2 and 9, 2007

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: JO Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Nadine Peterson, Christine Perron, Kevin Nyhan, Cathy Goodmen, and Nancy Mayville, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, Tanya Kress, Jim McConaha, and Linda Wilson, NHDHR; Bill O'Donnell FHWA; Rich Roach, Joe Redlinger, Steve Dermody, and Martin Curran, ACOE; Jocelyn Degler, DES Wetlands; Wade Brown and Scott Newnan, SEA; Elizabeth Corrow, Town of Bristol; Barbara Lucas, Town of New Hampton; Thomas Smith, Selectman, New Hampton; Steve Pesci, UNH; and Kevin Gagne, FST.

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

Milton 15142

Ashland-Bridgewater, X-A000(267), 1427

Programmatic Agreement

Bristol-New Hampton, 13573A

Durham, X-A000(068), 13868; X-A000(344), 14404

Newbury 14819, X-A000(547)

Chesterfield, SP-P3621E-

Surplus Lands

Greenville (no project numbers)

Bedford-Londonderry, DPR-F-0047(001), 11512

Tamworth, X-A000(299), 14317

Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-0931(174), 10418C

NHDOT Architectural Guidelines

Agenda

Thursday, August 2, 2007

Milton 15142. Participant: Kevin Nyhan.

Kevin Nyhan discussed this project, which involves widening a 250-foot section of roadway drainage ditch along NH Route 75 in Milton. Trees will be cut and stone will be used in the ditch. With the exception of a small sliver of drainage easement, all work will be conducted within the limits of existing right-of-way. A No Historic Properties Affected Memo can be signed at the next meeting. No further survey work is needed.

Ashland-Bridgewater, X-A000(267), 14272. Participant: Kevin Nyhan .

Kevin Nyhan presented this project, which involves the painting of the steel Pratt deck truss bridge (076/080) that carries US Route 3 over the Pemigewasset River and Boston – Maine Railroad between the towns of Ashland and Bridgewater. In addition, the project includes the clean up of paint chips that naturally fell off of the bridge. The bridge, built in 1937, is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (with a bridge score of 17) under Criterion C. A No Adverse Effect Memo can be signed. No further survey work is needed.

Programmatic Agreement. Participant: Nadine Peterson.

A revised draft version of the PA was provided to participants. N. Peterson noted that DOT has submitted the draft PA to the front office and received very minimal comment. The document was revised and is now ready to be forwarded to Mary Ann Naber, FHWA Historic Preservation Officer. N. Peterson will provide B. O'Donnell with a final draft version (through inter-agency mail) for his submittal to Mary Ann.

N. Peterson will contact Carol Legard at the ACHP to determine when it is appropriate to provide a draft for public review. N. Peterson will also confirm if there is a timeframe that the document must be made available to the public and in what forums are most appropriate.

Participants discussed forums that may be appropriate for public review. These would include posting the PA to both the NHDOT and NHDHR websites; placing a notice on various list-serves to advise those interested that the document has been posted or that it is available as a hard copy, publishing a notice in the next NHDHR/NH Preservation Alliance newsletter; and providing 25 hard copies of the document for submittal to send to various public libraries. When necessary, the 25 copies will be made by NHDOT and provided to L. Wilson for her distribution.

(Post-meeting follow-up on 8/6/2007: N. Peterson spoke with Carol Legard of ACHP. Carol suggested that the draft PA be emailed to her review concurrent with Mary Ann Naber's review. N. Peterson spoke with B. O'Donnell on 8/6/2007 and confirmed that she would email a draft copy of the PA to his attention so that he can forward it via email to both Carol and Mary Ann. N. Peterson presented Carol with information regarding New Hampshire's public involvement strategy of posting the draft PA to several websites, posting on list-serves, publishing a notice in the DHR newsletter, and providing copies to libraries. Carol thought that this was a good strategy and suggested a 30-60 public review period. Carol also wanted to ensure that the team provided Tribes with the opportunity to be aware of the PA. Carol suggested a letter be sent through FHWA to notify Tribes of this new policy. Finally, Carol also wanted to make sure that archaeologists and possibly avocational archaeologists were included in the list-serve mailing.)

Bristol-New Hampton, 13573A (no federal number). Participants: Scott Newnan and Wade Brown, SEA (Wade.Brown@seacon.com); Rich Roach, Steve Dermody, Martin Curran, and Joe Redlinger, USACOE; Jocelyn Degler, DES; Elizabeth Corrow, Town of Bristol; Barbara Lucas, Town of New Hampton; Thomas Smith, Selectman, New Hampton; and Jim McConaha and Tanya Kress, NHDHR.

After introductions, Wade Brown stated that the purpose of this meeting was to bring all of the Regulatory Permitting Agencies together to discuss the status of each permit and determine a schedule for when these permits would be approved. W. Brown informed the group about the urgency to get these approvals as soon as possible so construction can start. He told the group that the bridge had been downgraded to 10 tons back in June by the NHDOT and that with this posting the Towns can no longer bring emergency apparatus across the bridge for mutual aid.

NHDES Wetlands Permit

Jocelyn Degler provided an update on the Wetlands Permit Application. Jocelyn had received S E A's response letter dated July 9, 2007 on July 12, 2007. She said that by their rules she needs to look at and respond by August 12, 2007. She was fairly confident an approval is forthcoming soon.

J. Degler stated that DES would not issue a permit until they have received copies of signed permanent easement agreements. She said they do not require copies of signed temporary easement agreements, just permanent. Rich Roach asked J. Degler if there was any way to issue the permit with the condition that DES gets a signed copy prior to the start of construction. She said she would ask Hollis Adams if that was ok. Joe Redlinger then asked if it would help if the USACOE wrote a letter stating that they intended to grant permanent easements to the Towns for the construction of the Central Street Bridge. J. Degler affirmed and that if he did that, she would not have to ask Hollis Adams.

R. Roach and Joe Redlinger later informed the group that the Army Corp would not complete final paperwork for the permanent easements until after the Town had recorded the permanent easements with the Register of Deeds. However, they would grant the license for construction based on what has been presented to-date and trusting the Towns would act in good faith.

Scott Newnan informed J. Degler that the impacts have changed slightly since S E A's response on July 9, 2007. S. Newnan presented J. Degler with an 11X17 wetlands permit plan, as submitted to DES on July 9, 2007, and a plan showing the impact changes since that time (changes were highlighted on the plan). The primary reason for the changes was a result of the USACOE's request for a path and steps leading to the river. S. Newnan presented to J. Degler a copy of the most recent roadway plans showing the path location. She asked what kind of steps would be installed. S. Newnan told her they would be constructed of granite blocks used from the existing bridge. She said that NHDES does not allow that because it would require excavation into the riverbank and because the steps would need to be wood placed on the bank. N. Newnan told her that granite was selected in favor of wood for its inherent durability at a site known for fluctuating river elevation and high velocity. The Army Corp representatives voiced strong favor for the granite steps for safety and durability reasons. J. Degler asked S E A to provide her with a narrative as to why wooden steps will not work in this area as the least impacting alternative and why granite steps are a viable option.

Barbara Lucas mentioned a private property on the Bristol side, which could involve a future temporary easement depending on on-going negotiations with the owner. J. Degler indicated that only if it is a permanent easement would a letter of agreement be required from the property owner. W. Brown indicated the current design and forthcoming bid documents will allow the property to be avoided, but things could change during construction depending the way negotiation occurred between the Town of Bristol and the property owner. S E A will follow-up with a description/ narrative of this situation to J. Degler.

Memorandum of Agreement

Marketing of the Bridge: S E A stated the last day of advertisement for the sale of the bridge is today

August 2, 2007 and that the bid opening for this sale is August 6, 2007, which would conclude the 120-day advertising period required by the MOA. There have been no calls/responses to this round of advertisements.

HAER Documentation: W. Brown asked about the review of the HAER document. Joyce McKay and Jim Garvin said they have both reviewed it and had minor comments. J. McKay stated that she would compile them and send a copy to S E A within the next few days. S E A will then pass them on to their sub-consultant and ask him to incorporate them into his documentation and produce and submit the final HAER documentation. Rich asked about the historical memorial/sign marker and if there were any issues with it. Jim Garvin said they have looked at a schematic layout provide by S E A's consultant and had approved it.

Archaeological Phase 1B: W. Brown asked about the review of this document. J. McKay said she had reviewed it and provided comments to Edna Feighner a while ago and has since been unable to locate those comments. She said she had reviewed it again recently and emailed re-written comments to Edna and W. Brown. J. McKay and R. Roach stated that they thought E. Feighner's had concurred with her original comments. E. Feighner has been in the field and unable to follow-up but that she will return next week. J. McKay's comments were mostly a request that the archaeology consultant further substantiate their conclusions. She will check with E. Feighner on August 6th to see if she has any further comments. And, she will then forward any and all comments to S E A for forwarding to the consultant for review and revision to the report.

W. Brown, responding to a comment by Joe Redlinger, stated his understanding was that the proposed parking area at the bridge site on Coolidge Woods Road was included in the original Phase 1A and 1B study. Upon review of the Phase 1B report, Tanya Kress indicated that only about 75% of the parking area was included in their area of study. R. Roach requested that S E A contact the archeologist at U. of Maine to verify that they had looked at this area and in fact concur that there are no archaeological resources in this area.

B. Lucas stated the turnaround time for review of the archeology studies and HAER is specifically dictated in the MOA to be no more than 30 days. She requested that the remaining actions be expedited in order for construction to begin with no further delays. She informed everyone that the Towns are frustrated with how long this process has taken to date.

Compensatory Storage: R. Roach informed all that the USACOE requires compensatory storage for this project, stating that any fill in a flood plain, needs to be removed from another area. A site has been selected, which is located 0.55 miles south of the existing bridge site on Coolidge Woods Road. S E A has completed a schematic and final design of this site (S E A handed out plans to everyone), which includes improvements to an existing parking area used by boaters and swimmers.

Marcos Paiva (USACOE Archeologist) has reviewed the site plan and determined that a Phase 1A/1B archaeological study is required in the undisturbed areas. J. McKay and Tanya Kress recommended that E. Feighner be involved in reviewing the site and preparation of a draft scope of services for use by the archaeological consultant. Barbara Lucas asked S E A to contact the archaeologist for timeline to complete and determine the cost of the work. It was indicated that the area to be surveyed is identified with stakes.

B. Lucas asked if there was another site located within the flood plain without archaeological impacts in order to avoid the phase 1B, and any future delays to the process. Marty Curran, Joe and R. Roach stated this requirement would not delay the bridge project provided the Towns acted in good faith to proceed with archeological permitting process towards ultimately meeting the compensatory storage

requirements. S E A asked whether the Army Corp would require another site be investigated if archaeological resources were discovered at the current site. The Army Corp stated that it was highly unlikely the current site would have to be abandoned if resources were found. It would take a major find such as a Native American village for the permitting agencies to require a different site to meet compensatory storage requirements.

It was determined that the earliest practical date to advertise the bridge project for bid would be the first week of September. Wade stated S E A's goal was to submit final plans for review to the Towns and NHDOT on August 10, 2007. Nancy Mayville confirmed the DOT could turnaround the review in two weeks and have comments back to S E A by August 24, 2007 (14 days after Aug 10). S E A estimated it would take two additional weeks to make final changes to the plans and specs and therefore could advertise for bid during the first week of September. The permits will need to be finalized by then in order to include the Dredge and Fill Permit (NHDES wetland permit) in the bidding documents.

The method of bridge removal and the coordination of such were discussed. Wade stated the plan was to allow the contractor to drop the bridge in the river and pick it out in pieces. This was discussed and approved at the Natural Resources Agency Coordination meeting (held on March 21, 2007). Steve Dermody, Acting Park Manager of USACOE, asked to be notified by the contractor or engineer one week prior to dropping the bridge into the river. USACOE approval would then be granted depending on the weather forecast. S E A would dictate in the bid documents a maximum duration to be allowed for completing the removal from the river. S E A would also check with PSNH (Ayers Island Dam upstream) about potential release dates and provide such information to the Contractor. The Contractor would be required to communicate with the USACOE and PSNH during construction.

J. Redlinger requested that a surveyor at the contractor's expense replace any property bounds disturbed during construction. S E A confirmed this would be a stipulation given on the plans.

Action Items:

- S E A to submit narrative to NHDES (Jocelyn Degler) for Wetland Permit.
- Rich Roach to send letter to NHDES (Jocelyn Degler) regarding permanent easement acceptance.
- Joyce McKay to compile HAER comments and forward to S E A.
- Joyce McKay to inform Edna Feighner on Monday and ask her to provide S E A w/ review comments on Phase 1B Study.
- Joyce McKay to inform Edna Feighner on Monday and have her look at compensatory storage site and develop Phase 1B scope of work for S E A to provide to sub-consultant.
- S E A to contact archaeological sub regarding timeframe and cost of Phase 1B study for the compensatory area.
- S E A to pass on archaeological review comments (once received from E. Feighner) to sub-consultant for final report revision.
- S E A to pass on HAER Document review comments (once received from J. McKay) to sub-consultant for final report revision.

Thursday, August 9, 2007

Durham, X-A000(068), 13868; X-A000(344), 14404. Participant: Steve Pesci, UNH; Norm Larson, Christopher Williams Architects; Doug Bencks, Director of Campus Planning.

Steve Pesci gave an overview of the UNH Intermodal Rail Station project, projects CMAQ 13868 and TE 14404. The site work portion has been submitted to NHDOT as a 100% plan and is near construction approval. The building plan was submitted on July 31 to NHDOT at 90% review level. In general, the site work is funded 100% through the CMAQ grant, while the building is a shared CMAQ/TE project.

UNH has received conditional approval for construction for all work *excluding* the building. Per the committee's request at the last meeting in May, Pesci and Larson presented the plans as they currently stand to solicit comments. Following this meeting, barring any glaring omissions, the required CE forms for the project including the site and building will be submitted.

Doug Bencks, Director of Campus Planning and University Architect, led the presentation of the building plans. He pointed out that the design has followed the direction presented in May. That concept created a building addition under the trackside canopy running the length of the original station and extending approximately 12' beyond the south wall of the existing building.

90% plans were reviewed among the members. D. Bencks discussed some of the building features including slate roof, glass and wood features of infill, and restoration of building features.

Questions from members:

- Are there any changes since the last presentation
 - No, only refinements. The concept presented has carried through to final plans.
- Concerns regarding venting on the roof. The project's unique location makes the roof especially visible to pedestrians from the Main Street bridge overpass.
 - Agreed and the actual vent location is not clearly or yet shown on the roof plan. We concur with Jim Garvin's comments that the vent must be placed as inconspicuously as possible and hopefully over the visible ridgeline of the roof. However, it must be understood that the vent is a required part of the project. Final plans will take this issue into consideration and attempt to put it on the valley/trackside.
- J. Garvin raised a question regarding the slate referenced on the plan. It states "unfading green" but UNH has stated that it would attempt to use Munson or closest match, not green.
 - This is an error on the plan. We are going to use black slate similar to the 2001 canopy construction done by NHDOT. The University will speak with the architect regarding confirming source and correct in detail on the plan
- Is UNH going to replace drainage system with copper drainage system to match canopy and install copper finials and cresting?
 - Yes.
- Will there be any changes to the roof structure?
 - Only as needed to reinforce the roof gable over the canopy. No other structural change is needed since the roof is already designed to hold the weight of slate, etc.
- Please show detail of interior roof in new section. Committee hopes it will be matching bead board.
 - That is the intention at this time.

The committee was generally pleased with the plans. UNH was asked to complete the meeting notes for review and complete final additional paperwork for inclusion in the CE documentation. We expect a finding of *No Adverse Effect* for the building. This form will be provided to UNH electronically. It was also noted that an interpretive kiosk would be erected at the station and a luggage cart was being rehabilitated to display at the depot. NHDHR requested a copy of the text.

Newbury 14819, X-A000(547): Participants: J. McKay for Michael Vignale, KV Partners LLC (mvignale@kvpllc.com).

E. Feighner requested that a Phase IA be conducted for the bridge and areas of impact adjacent to the meetinghouse. The level of survey would be based on the extent of impact, the breadth and depth of excavation.

Chesterfield, SP-P3621E-2. Participant: Christine Perron.

The subject parcel is 1.78 acres and located on the southerly side of US Route 9 in Chesterfield. Given the parcel's small size and history of disturbance, there were no concerns for archeological resources at this site and, therefore, no further review is necessary.

Surplus Lands

NHDOT surplus lands no longer go to CHORD for review. It was agreed that NHDHR did not need copies of surplus land forms if review in-house by J. McKay or in the Cultural Resources meeting. If there are remaining questions, then NHDHR may request a copy of the form for its review or it has not been reviewed under the above circumstances.

Greenville (no project numbers). Participants: J. McKay and N. Peterson.

N. Peterson and J. McKay review the stone box culvert in Greenville in the field. The stone line channels connect the culvert to the remnants of a dam at one end and to a mill site at the other. Based on the tool marks on the stone, it appears to be an early culvert at least a portion of which pre-dates approximately 1830. Since the structure appears to be quite intact, NHDHR found the culvert to be eligible. NHDHR requested that the culvert be repaired in-kind, which is the current plan. If there will be changes to the structure, then the district project should be reviewed again at a Cultural Resources Meeting.

Bedford-Londonderry, DPR-F-0047(001), 11512. Participant: Cathy Goodmen.

Surplus land lies in Bedford at the Merrimack town line. An abutter wishes to purchase approximately 18 acres of land that was purchased for the above project and is not directly needed for that project. A portion of this parcel was previously a sand and gravel pit. Pointer Club Brook, which outlets to the Merrimack River, approximately .25 miles to the east runs through the parcel. The parcel was not included in the archaeological study conducted for the above project. Being this close to the Merrimack, it appears to be sensitive for archaeological resources. It was requested that if the NHDOT agrees to sell this property, a clause be included in agreement that requires any purchaser conduct all necessary phases of archaeological survey before the sale is finalized.

Tamworth, X-A000(299), 14317. Participant: Kevin Gagne, FST (kgagne@fstinc.com).

Kevin Gagne of FST reported on the status of the project, particularly discussing and resolving outstanding issues relating to the Chocorua Village Project drainage and associated archaeological impacts and ornamental lighting. An overview was provided of the proposed drainage within the project area, utilizing a plan with proposed drainage highlighted in red. Cross sections of the same area were reviewed with drainage designed as per NHDOT standards (4' of cover over pipe) highlighted in red. The potential for impacts to archaeologically sensitive areas caused by excavations at this depth was discussed. FST presented an alternative option using slab topped catch basins and stronger drainpipe to achieve a drainage design with 2' of pipe cover. The option was plotted on cross sections in blue color. The conceptual drainage work and cross section in the proposed bio-retention area on the old village store parcel was discussed. Consensus was reached that the drainage design w/ 2' of cover would alleviate concerns regarding archaeological impact. FST will proceed with the revisions to the drainage design.

FST presented an overview of the substantial coordination regarding ornamental lighting that has transpired since the last meeting between FST, Linda Wilson (NHDHR) and Lynne Monroe (Preservation Company). A series of lighting pole and arm options previously included in the aforementioned coordination were reviewed, with Linda's preferences highlighted. L. Wilson had indicated that simplicity in design was the key (not too ornate). The options discussed were:

1. The King Luminaire Company Inc.'s K201-32 "The Radian" Luminaire. The preferred posts were the KYC17 "Canterbury Coachman" and the KM90RE-17. The preferred arm was the KA57 "Sweep Arm."
2. Holophane Lighting's #GR 10DMH MA 2 B S 95 N "Radial Wave Glaswerks II" (item number may differ for different color). The preferred post was the "Rockford Harbor Series." The preferred arm was the "GlasWerks Series Crossarm."

The preferred color was forest green for metal poles, or natural old cast stone color if spun concrete poles were used. Consensus preference was for the simplicity of a straight pole rather than fluted, but fluted would be OK if strongly desired by the Town. The Town will select preferred pole material (aluminum or concrete) based on its priorities (durability, cost etc.).

Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-0931(174), 10418C. Participant: Joyce McKay.

J. McKay reviewed the status of the George Armstrong House in Windham. She explained that the Common Man is currently reconfiguring its property for the I-93 project. The George Armstrong house site is part of that reconfiguration. NHDOT had been asked to advertise the building for sale. However, the building cannot be fit under the two I-93 overpasses between which the house sits. This constraint would require the prospective buyer to relocate the house twice, once prior to the building of the parking lot and once after one of the overpasses is removed. With this added complication, advertising appears to be problematic. L. Wilson concurred. [Subsequently, it has been found that Alex Ray is attempting to retain the main portion of the building on site.]

The Robert Armstrong House was also discussed. Alex Ray is attempting to determine the cost of its stabilization and has completed initial coordination with Frank Whittemore concerning that cost. The largest hurdle is accomplishing ventilation in a manner that does not cosmetically detract from the appearance of the building. J. Garvin and L. Wilson suggested placing a heavy six mil. polyethylene barrier on the floor to prevent rising damp. It was further suggested that the building be vented from

the back through wood louvers placed in the existing openings and/or in the space left by removing the barn. It should also be vented out the gables using screening to prevent the entrance of animals.

NHDOT Architectural Guidelines.

Nadine Peterson presented the recently revised architectural guidelines and survey form. Neither FHWA nor NHDHR provided comments on this final draft.

****Memos:** Hampton 14532W

Submitted by Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager

S:\MEETINGS\SHPO\07minutes\8-2-9.doc